

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
Administration for Children and Families  
Administration on Children, Youth and Families  
Children's Bureau

**Final Report**  
**Illinois Child and Family Services Review**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Final Report: Illinois Child and Family Services Review**

This document presents the findings of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the State of Illinois. The CFSR assesses State performance with regard to seven child and family outcomes and seven systemic factors. The Illinois CFSR was conducted the week of September 15, 2003. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the State child welfare agency – the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS);
- The State Data Profile, prepared by the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which provides State child welfare data for the years 1999 through 2001;
- Reviews of 48 cases at three sites (Charleston, Cook County, and Rock Island) in the State; and
- Interviews or focus groups (conducted at all three sites and at the State-level) with stakeholders including, but not limited to children, parents, foster parents, all levels of child welfare agency personnel, collaborating agency personnel, service providers, court personnel, and attorneys.

The Statewide Assessment documents several areas in which the State of Illinois has achieved major progress and made notable changes in serving children in child welfare over the past few years. Some of these changes provide important context for interpreting the findings of the CFSR. For example, one of the most striking changes is the dramatic reduction in the number of children in foster care in the State. According to the Statewide Assessment, the State has reduced the number of children in foster care from a peak of 50,575 in 1997 to fewer than 21,000 in March 2003. The State attributes this progress to Juvenile Court reforms, the implementation of Performance Based Contracting, the effect of the Illinois Permanency Initiative, and the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). Another example is the increased number of adoptions that Illinois achieved for children in foster care over the past few years. The Statewide Assessment documents record numbers of children placed for adoption in the State in 1998 and 1999, and strong performance in the number of adoptions in succeeding years.

Both the Statewide Assessment and stakeholders interviewed onsite acknowledged that, with these changes, the State is now faced with achieving permanency for an increasingly older population of youth with complex needs and a large number of children coming into care for reasons related to parental substance abuse. Many of the children remaining in care are not in the permanent homes where they will remain or to which they will be discharged to guardianship or adoption, and the State faces many challenges in achieving timely and appropriate permanency outcomes for these children. This observation is borne out in the finding of the Illinois CFSR that the State is not in substantial conformity with any of the seven child welfare outcomes assessed through the CFSR. One of the weakest areas of State performance on the outcomes occurred for Permanency Outcome 1 (Children have permanency and stability in their living situations). Despite the State's past

gains in increasing the number of children exiting foster care to permanent living arrangements, during the onsite review this outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in only 36 percent of the foster care cases reviewed; all indicators for the item were rated as an Area Needing Improvement. In addition, the State data for fiscal year 2001 pertaining to measures relevant to this outcome did not meet the national standards. Although the case reviews revealed many instances of concerted efforts to achieve this outcome, the data provided in the State Data Profile as well as the findings of the case review process indicate a lack of consistency with respect to efforts to ensure placement stability for children in foster care, establish permanency goals in a timely manner, achieve permanency for children (through adoption, reunification, or permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner, and ensure that older children in long-term foster care receive appropriate services to assist them in making the transition from foster care to independent living.

Information from the Statewide Assessment and from stakeholders interviewed during the onsite CFSR suggest that the State's low level of performance with regard to achieving Permanency Outcome 1 may be attributed in part to one or more of the following court-related issues: (1) some judges in the State do not adhere to the timelines for permanency established by the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA); (2) because of the general reluctance of some judges to terminate parental rights, they extend the timeframe for parents to achieve goals, even when the prognosis for reunification is low; (3) judges frequently grant continuances for hearings; (4) agency attorneys are unwilling to file for termination of parental rights unless an adoptive placement has been identified; (5) there are considerable delays in the initial adjudication hearing, which sometimes does not take place until a child has been in foster care for 9 months; and (6) there is a lengthy appeals process for termination of parental rights that can take a year or longer to complete.

Another area of concern identified through the CFSR pertained to the State's performance on Well-Being Outcome 1 (Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs). Only 52.1 percent of the applicable cases reviewed were determined to have substantially achieved this outcome. The CFSR case reviews resulted in all indicators for this outcome being rated as areas in need of improvement. DCFS was found to be inconsistent in its efforts to assess needs and provide services to families, involve parents and children in the case planning process, and ensure that caseworkers establish sufficient contact with the children and parents in their caseloads. A key concern with regard to this outcome was that DCFS did not make diligent efforts to involve fathers in all relevant aspects of the case, particularly non-custodial fathers. In addition, stakeholders expressed the opinion that when caseworkers implemented some form of family conferencing or family team meetings, parents and children were more likely to be involved in case planning, have service needs assessed and addressed, and have sufficient contact with caseworkers than when this type of structural approach was not implemented.

The State's performance with respect to Well-Being Outcome 3 (Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs) also was an identified concern, with only 66.6 percent of applicable cases rated as having substantially achieved this outcome. Information from case reviews and stakeholder interviews indicated that many children in DCFS caseloads have mental health service needs that are not being addressed. Stakeholders expressed the opinion that this problem may be attributed to a scarcity of adequate mental health assessment and treatment services throughout the State.

A significant finding of the case reviews was that the Charleston site performed considerably better than the other sites on most of the outcomes. All cases (100%) reviewed in Charleston were rated as having substantially achieved Safety Outcome 2, Permanency Outcome 2, and Well-Being Outcome 2. In addition, 89 percent of the Charleston cases were determined to have substantially achieved Safety Outcome 1, 83 percent substantially achieved Permanency Outcome 1, and 83 percent substantially achieved Well-Being Outcome 3. However, only 58 percent of the cases in Charleston achieved Well-Being Outcome 1. The low level of performance on this outcome was due to the lack of involvement of fathers in various aspects of the case process. Stakeholders in this site noted that services are readily available to assist families when children remain in their homes; that family team meetings are implemented on a regular basis to develop case plans and permanency goals; that the courts, the parents, and the agency work together to establish appropriate permanency goals, when necessary; and that there is a process in place that is effective in promoting voluntary relinquishments of parental rights, which eliminates the need to engage in a lengthy termination of parental rights (TPR) process.

With regard to the systemic factors, the State was determined to be in substantial conformity with the factors of Statewide Information System; Quality Assurance System; Training; Agency Responsiveness to the Community; and Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. The State did not achieve substantial conformity with the systemic factors of Case Review System and Service Array.

The overall findings with regard to the State's performance on the safety and permanency outcomes are presented in table 1 at the end of the Executive Summary. Findings regarding well-being outcomes are presented in table 2. Table 3 presents the State's performance relative to the national standards and table 4 provides information pertaining to the State's substantial conformity with the seven systemic factors assessed through the CFSR.

## **I. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO OUTCOMES**

### **Safety Outcome 1: Children are first and foremost protected from abuse and neglect**

Safety Outcome 1 incorporates two indicators. One pertains to the timeliness of initiating a response to a child maltreatment report (item 1), and the other relates to the recurrence of substantiated or indicated maltreatment for the same children (item 2).

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 1. Although the outcome was substantially achieved in 90.9 percent of the cases reviewed, which is greater than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity, the State Data Profile indicates that the State did not meet the national standard for the percentage of children experiencing more than one substantiated or indicated child maltreatment report

within a 6-month period. It is necessary for the State to meet both the national standards and the case review criteria to achieve substantial conformity with the outcome. Performance on this outcome did not differ substantively across CFSR sites (given the differences in the number of applicable cases for each site). The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 96 percent of Cook County cases, 89 percent of Charleston cases, and 80 percent of Rock Island cases.

A key finding of the CFSR case reviews was that DCFS is consistent in responding to maltreatment reports in accordance with the State's timeframes. In 92 percent of the applicable cases reviewed, DCFS established face-to-face contact with the child victim within 24 hours of receipt of the maltreatment report, which is the State-required timeframe for responding to all maltreatment reports.

Although the State did not meet the national standard for the incidence of maltreatment recurrence within 6 months, the case reviews found no maltreatment recurrence in 93 percent of the applicable cases. However, in 3 (33%) of the 9 cases in which there was at least one substantiated report during the period under review, there was another substantiated report within a 6-month period. In addition, many stakeholders reported that DCFS does not consistently report maltreatment allegations on open cases to the Hotline for investigation. Stakeholders also noted that often when maltreatment allegations on open cases are reported to the Hotline, the Hotline refuses to refer them for investigation because the case is already open. Consequently, it is possible that the actual rate of maltreatment recurrence within 6 months may be higher than the rate reported in the State Data Profile.

## **Safety Outcome 2: Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate**

Performance on Safety Outcome 2 is assessed through two indicators. One indicator (item 3) addresses the issue of child welfare agency efforts to prevent children's removal from their homes by providing services to the families that ensure children's safety while they remain in their homes. The other indicator (item 4) pertains to the child welfare agency's efforts to reduce risk of harm to children.

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Safety Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was substantially achieved in 81.2 percent of the cases reviewed, which does not meet the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome varied substantively across the CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 100 percent of Charleston cases, compared to 77 percent of Cook County cases and 70 percent of Rock Island cases.

The CFSR case reviews found that DCFS is not consistent in providing appropriate services to families to protect children in the home and prevent their removal, and is not consistent in making concerted efforts to reduce the risk of harm to children. A key concern identified pertained to the lack of comprehensive risk and safety assessments, which results in the delivery of services that are not appropriate to ensure the child's safety and reduce risk of harm over the long term. Another key concern identified pertained to the lack of diligent monitoring of children's safety while they are in residential and group care facilities.

## **Permanency Outcome 1: Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.**

There are six indicators incorporated in the assessment of permanency outcome 1, although not all of them are relevant for all children. The indicators pertain to the child welfare agency's efforts to prevent foster care re-entry (item 5), ensure placement stability for children in foster care (item 6), and establish appropriate permanency goals for children in foster care in a timely manner (item 7). Depending on the child's permanency goal, the remaining indicators focus on the child welfare agency's efforts to achieve permanency goals (such as reunification, guardianship, adoption, and permanent placement with relatives) in a timely manner (items 8 and 9), or to ensure that children who have "other planned living arrangements" as a case goal are in stable placements and adequately prepared for eventual independent living (item 10).

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 1. This was based on the following findings:

- The outcome was substantially achieved in 36.0 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for a determination of substantial conformity.
- Fiscal year (FY) 2001 data reported in the State Data Profile indicate that the State did not meet the national standards for (1) the percentage of children who entered foster care who were re-entering within 12 months of discharge from a prior foster care episode, (2) the percentage of children who achieved reunification within 12 months of entry into foster care, (3) the percentage of children who achieved a finalized adoption within 24 months of entry into foster care, and (4) the percentage of children in foster care for less than 12 months who experienced no more than 2 placement settings.

Case review ratings for this outcome varied substantively across CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 83 percent of Charleston cases, compared to 33 percent of Rock Island cases and 15 percent of Cook County cases.

The results of the case reviews and the data provided in the State Data Profile suggest that DCFS is not consistent with regard to making concerted efforts to (1) ensure children's placement stability while in foster care, (2) establish appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner, or (3) achieve children's permanency goals in a timely manner. Although data provided in the State Data Profile indicate that for FY 2001, the State's rate of re-entry into foster care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode (8.8%) did not meet the national standard of 8.6 percent or less, the case reviews found no re-entries into foster care for the 6 cases applicable for this assessment. To resolve this discrepancy, the CFSR reviewed State data for 2002 and found that the State's rate of re-entry into foster care in FY 2002 of 8.2 percent did meet the national standard. Consequently, this indicator (item 5) was rated as a Strength.

Despite case review findings, many stakeholders commenting on this outcome expressed the opinion that DCFS makes concerted efforts to establish appropriate permanency goals in a timely manner. However, several stakeholders reported that DCFS efforts to establish

appropriate goals in a timely manner sometimes are hampered by delays in court scheduling and, as noted by Cook County stakeholders, by the practice of some judges of granting parents multiple opportunities to comply with service plans in order to achieve reunification (particularly in cases involving parental substance abuse). In addition, some stakeholders noted that because only a judge can change a permanency goal, it often happens that an out-dated or inappropriate goal remains in a case file until the next court hearing, even though the caseworker is actually pursuing a new goal.

### **Permanency Outcome 2. The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for children.**

Permanency Outcome 2 incorporates six indicators that assess the child welfare agency's performance with regard to (1) placing children in foster care in close proximity to their parents and close relatives (item 11); (2) placing siblings together (item 12); (3) ensuring frequent visitation between children and their parents and siblings in foster care (item 13); (4) preserving connections of children in foster care with extended family, community, cultural heritage, religion, and schools (item 14); (5) seeking relatives as potential placement resources (item 15); and (6) promoting the relationship between children and their parents while the children are in foster care (item 16).

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Permanency Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 76.0 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome varied substantively across CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 100 percent of Charleston and Rock Island foster care cases, compared to 54 percent of Cook County foster care cases.

CFSR case reviews found that DCFS makes concerted efforts to ensure that (1) children are placed in foster care placements that are in close proximity to the family and community of origin (item 11), (2) siblings are placed together in foster care whenever appropriate (item 12); and (3) children's primary connections are preserved while they are in foster care (item 14). However, CFSR case review findings also indicate that DCFS is inconsistent in its efforts to ensure that (1) visitation between parents and children and between siblings is of sufficient frequency to meet children's needs (item 13); (2) relatives, particularly paternal relatives, are located and assessed as potential placement resources, particularly paternal relatives (item 15), and (3) the parent-child relationship of children in foster care is supported and strengthened (item 16).

### **Well Being Outcome 1: Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.**

Well Being Outcome 1 incorporates four indicators. One pertains to the child welfare agency's efforts to ensure that the service needs of children, parents, and foster parents are assessed and that the necessary services are provided to meet identified needs (item 17). A second indicator examines the child welfare agency's efforts to actively involve parents and children (when appropriate) in the case planning process

(item 18). The two remaining indicators examine the frequency and quality of caseworker's contacts with the children in their caseloads (item 19) and with the children's parents (item 20).

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 1. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 52.1 percent of the cases reviewed, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome varied substantively across the CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 70 percent of Rock Island cases, compared to 58 percent of Charleston cases and 42 percent of Cook County cases.

A key CFSR finding was that all indicators for this outcome were rated as areas needing improvement. Case reviews found that DCFS does not consistently make concerted efforts to (1) assess needs of, and provide services to, children, parents, and foster parents; (2) involve children and parents in case planning; or (3) establish face-to-face contact with children and parents with sufficient frequency and quality to ensure children's safety and/or promote attainment of case goals. One particularly concern pertained to the lack of involvement of fathers in case planning and in service assessments. This was the primary reason for the low performance on this outcome in the Charleston site.

#### **Well-Being Outcome 2: Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.**

There is only one indicator for Well-Being Outcome 2. It pertains to the child welfare agency's efforts to address and meet the educational needs of children in both foster care and in-home services cases (item 21).

Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 2. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 84.4 percent of the cases reviewed, which does not meet the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome differed somewhat across CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 100 percent of Charleston cases, compared to 80 percent of Rock Island cases and 78 percent of Cook County cases.

A key CFSR finding was that DCFS is not consistent in its efforts to assess children's educational needs and provide appropriate services to meet those needs.

#### **Well-Being Outcome 3: Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.**

This outcome incorporates two indicators that assess the child welfare agency's efforts to meet children's physical health (item 22) and mental health (item 23) needs.



Illinois did not achieve substantial conformity with Well-Being Outcome 3. This determination was based on the finding that the outcome was rated as substantially achieved in 66.6 percent of the cases, which is less than the 90 percent required for substantial conformity. Performance on this outcome varied substantively across CFSR sites. The outcome was determined to be substantially achieved in 83 percent of Charleston cases, 70 percent of Rock Island cases, and 58 percent of Cook County cases.

A key CFSR finding is that DCFS is does not consistently make concerted effort to meet children's physical and mental health needs. One concern identified pertained to a lack of providers in the State who will accept Medicaid for dental and mental health services. Information from case reviews and stakeholder interviews indicate that many children in DCFS caseloads have mental health service needs that are not being addressed.

## **II. KEY FINDINGS RELATED TO SYSTEMIC FACTORS**

### **Statewide Information System**

Substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Statewide Information System is determined by whether the State is operating a Statewide information system that can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals for children in foster care.

Illinois was determined to be in substantial conformity with this systemic factor. The CFSR found that the current information system is available Statewide and can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location, and goals of children in foster care.

### **Case Review System**

Five indicators are used to assess the State's performance with regard to the systemic factor of a Case Review System. The indicators examine the development of case plans and parent involvement in that process (item 25), the consistency of 6-month case reviews (item 26) and 12-month permanency hearings (item 27), the implementation of procedures to seek termination of parental rights (TPR) in accordance with the timeframes established in the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) (item 28), and the notification and inclusion of foster and pre-adoptive parents and relative caregivers in case reviews and hearings (item 29).

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Case Review System. Information from the CFSR indicates that the case plans for many of the children do not reflect the needs and problems identified in the assessment process, and children's parents, particularly their fathers, are not consistently involved in the case planning process. In addition, the CFSR identified multiple barriers to pursuing TPR in accordance with the provisions of ASFA, including: (1) the extensive screening process that agency attorneys must conduct in order to file

a TPR petition, (2) the frequent granting of continuances by the court, and (3) the court and agency practice of routinely maintaining a plan of reunification for at least 9 months even when in some situations, it would be appropriate for the agency to exercise the right to forego reasonable efforts.

Despite these concerns, CFSR information also indicates that periodic reviews of the status of each child are being conducted every 6 months in a high percentage of cases and permanency hearings are held 12 months after temporary custody is awarded to the State; subsequent permanency hearings often are held every 6 months, which exceeds the Federal requirement. In addition, the State has established a set of procedures for notifying foster and adoptive caretakers of hearings and reviews and most stakeholders reported that foster parents, preadoptive parents, and relative caregivers have an opportunity to be heard in the reviews and hearings.

### **Quality Assurance System**

Performance with regard to the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System is based on whether the State has developed standards to ensure the safety and health of children in foster care (item 30), and whether the State is operating a statewide quality assurance system that evaluates the quality and effectiveness of services and measures program strengths and areas needing improvement (item 31).

Illinois was found to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Quality Assurance System. The CFSR determined that Illinois has developed and implemented standards to ensure that children in foster care are provided quality services that protect their safety and health. In addition, information from the CFSR indicates that Illinois is operating an identifiable quality assurance (QA) system that focuses on assessing outcomes and on evaluating the quality of services and the service delivery system.

### **Training**

The systemic factor of Training incorporates an assessment of the State's new caseworker training program (item 32), ongoing training for child welfare agency staff (item 33), and training for foster and adoptive parents (item 34).

Illinois was determined to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Training. Information from the CFSR indicates that ongoing training is available for staff from both DCFS and Purchase of Service (POS) agencies (i.e. private agencies with which DCFS has contracts), and that DCFS requires staff to participate in ongoing training. In addition, the CFSR determined that Illinois provides quality training to foster parents.

Despite these favorable findings, however, the Statewide Assessment notes that the current initial training for staff does not adequately prepare incoming staff to comprehensively identify and assess needs, engage families in case and service planning, plan for reunification,

advocate with the various systems involved (particularly the courts and education systems), and link families to appropriate services. These training concerns are consistent with the issues identified during the CFSR case review process.

### **Service Array**

The assessment of the systemic factor of Service Array addresses three questions: (1) Does the State have in place an array of services to meet the needs of children and families served by the child welfare agency (item 35)? (2) Are these services accessible to families and children throughout the State (item 36)? (3) Can services be individualized to meet the unique needs of the children and family served by the child welfare agency (item 37)?

Illinois is not in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Service Array. The CFSR determined that although the State allocates significant resources to services, the level of existing services does not meet the need. The CFSR identified significant service gaps including appropriate out-of-home placement resources, particularly for adolescents; children's mental health services; culturally responsive services; and services to address family issues of substance abuse, mental health, and domestic violence. In addition, the CFSR found that services are not accessible in all parts of Illinois and in some areas where services are available, there are long waiting lists to access the services. Although Child and Adolescent Local Area Networks have been developed to support the availability of services in each part of Illinois, there is considerable variation in the services available through the various Local Area Networks. Stakeholders reported that not all of them have the resources to meet their objectives. Finally, the CFSR found that there is a lack of individualization of services in the State's most populous county, in which over 60 percent of the children in foster care are served. The CFSR also found that the DCFS assessment process was not consistently effective in identifying the unique needs of children and families. Although an Integrated Assessment Tool is being piloted, at the time of the onsite CFSR it was not yet fully implemented.

### **Agency Responsiveness to the Community**

Performance with regard to the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community incorporates an assessment of the State's consultation with external stakeholders in developing the Child and Family Services Plan (items 38 and 39), and the extent to which the State coordinates child welfare services with services or benefits of other Federal or federally-assisted programs serving the same population (item 40).

Illinois is in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Agency Responsiveness to the Community. The CFSR determined that the State engages in ongoing consultation with a wide range of stakeholders in developing the Child and Family Services Plan and that many stakeholders have significant input into the agency's Annual Reports of Progress and Services. In addition, the CFSR identified several substantial efforts on the part of DCFS to coordinate services with other Federal or federally-funded programs serving the same population.

## **Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention**

The assessment of this systemic factor focuses on the State's standards for foster homes and child care institutions (items 41 and 42), the State's compliance with Federal requirements for criminal background checks for foster and adoptive parents (item 43), the State's efforts to recruit foster and adoptive parents that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of foster children (item 44), and the State's activities with regard to using cross-jurisdictional resources to facilitate permanent placements for waiting children (item 45).

Illinois was found to be in substantial conformity with the systemic factor of Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment, and Retention. The CFSR found that the State's standards for foster family homes and child care institutions are generally in accord with recommended national standards, licensing standards are applied to all licensed (relative and non-relative) foster care families and child care institutions, and criminal background checks are completed as required.

The CFSR also determined that Illinois has established a process for ensuring the diligent recruitment of potential foster and adoptive families that reflect the ethnic and racial diversity of children in the State for whom foster and adoptive homes are needed. In addition, the CFSR determined that the State has an effective process for the use of cross-jurisdictional resources.

**Table 1. Illinois CFSR Ratings for Safety and Permanency Outcomes and Items**

Outcomes and Indicators	Outcome Ratings			Item Ratings		
	<i>In Substantial Conformity?</i>	<i>Percent Substantially Achieved*</i>	<i>Met National Standards?</i>	<i>Rating**</i>	<i>Percent Strength</i>	<i>Met National Standards</i>
Safety Outcome 1-Children are first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect	No	90.9	Met 1, Did not meet 1			
Item 1: Timeliness of investigations				Strength	92	
Item 2: Repeat maltreatment				ANI	93	No
Safety Outcome 2 – Children are safely maintained in their homes when possible and appropriate	No	81.2				
Item 3: Services to prevent removal				ANI	77	
Item 4: Risk of harm				ANI	81	
Permanency Outcome 1- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations	No	36.0				
Item 5: Foster care re-entry				Strength	100	No***
Item 6: Stability of foster care placements				ANI	84	No
Item 7: Permanency goal for child				ANI	64	
Item 8: Reunification, guardianship and placement with relatives				ANI	43	No
Item 9: Adoption				ANI	40	No
Item 10: Other planned living arrangement				ANI	33	
Permanency Outcome 2 - The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved	No	76.0				
Item 11: Proximity of placement				Strength	100	
Item 12: Placement with siblings				Strength	95	
Item 13: Visiting with parents and siblings in foster care				ANI	71	
Item 14: Preserving connections				Strength	92	
Item 15: Relative placement				ANI	76	
Item 16: Relationship of child in care with parents				ANI	77	

\*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

\*\*Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

\*\*\*Illinois' FY 2001 data did not meet the national standard for this item. However, all cases were rated as a Strength. To resolve the discrepancy, Illinois' FY 2002 data for this measure was reviewed. Because the FY 2002 data (8.2%) met the national standard, the item was rated as a Strength.

**Table 2. Illinois CFSR Ratings for Child and Family Well Being Outcomes and Items**

<b>Outcomes and Indicators</b>	<b>Outcome Ratings</b>		<b>Item Ratings</b>			
	<i><b>In Substantial Conformity?</b></i>	<i><b>Percent Substantially Achieved*</b></i>	<i><b>Met National Standards</b></i>	<i><b>Rating**</b></i>	<i><b>Percent Strength</b></i>	<i><b>Met National Standards</b></i>
Well Being Outcome 1 - Families have enhanced capacity to provide for children's needs	No	52.1				
Item 17: Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents				ANI	54	
Item 18: Child/family involvement in case planning				ANI	57	
Item 19: Worker visits with child				ANI	83	
Item 20: Worker visits with parents				ANI	55	
Well Being Outcome 2 - Children receive services to meet their educational needs	No	84.4				
Item 21: Educational needs of child				ANI	84	
Well Being Outcome 3 - Children receive services to meet their physical and mental health needs are met	No	66.6				
Item 22: Physical health of child				ANI	83	
Item 23: Mental health of child				ANI	66	

\*90 percent of the applicable cases reviewed must be rated as having substantially achieved the outcome for the State to be in substantial conformity with the outcome.

\*\*Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).

**Table 3: Illinois' Performance on the Six Outcome Measures for Which National Standards have been Established**

<b>Outcome Measure</b>	<b>National Standard</b>	<b>Illinois Data FY 2001</b>
Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report in the first 6 months of CY 2001, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated report within a 6-month period?	6.1% or less	10.1%
Of all children who were in foster care in the first 9 months of CY 2001, what percent experienced maltreatment from foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57% or less	0.57%
Of all children who entered foster care in FY 2001, what percent were re-entering care within 12 months of a prior foster care episode?	8.6% or less	8.8%*
Of all children reunified from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into foster care?	76.2% or more	51.7%
Of all children who were adopted from foster care in FY 2001, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into foster care?	32.0% or more	8.8%
Of all children in foster care during FY 2001 for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7% or more	81.0%

\*Illinois' FY 2001 data did not meet the national standard for this item. However, all cases were rated as a Strength. To resolve the discrepancy, Illinois' FY 2002 data for this measure was reviewed. Because the FY 2002 data (8.2%) met the national standard, item 5 was rated as a Strength.

**Table 4: Illinois CFSR Ratings for the Seven Systemic Factors**

<b>Systemic Factors</b>	<b>In Substantial Conformity?*</b>	<b>Rating**</b>
<b>IV. Statewide Information System</b>	Yes (4)	
Item 24: System can identify the status, demographic characteristics, location and goals of children in foster care		Strength
<b>V. Case Review System</b>	No (2)	
Item 25: Process for developing a case plan and for joint case planning with parents		ANI
Item 26: Process for 6-month case reviews		Strength
Item 27: Process for 12-month permanency hearings		Strength
Item 28: Process for seeking TPR in accordance with ASFA		ANI
Item 29: Process for notifying caregivers of reviews and hearings and for opportunity for them to be heard		Strength
<b>VI. Quality Assurance System</b>	Yes (4)	
Item 30: Standards to ensure quality services and ensure children's safety and health		Strength
Item 31: Identifiable QA system that evaluates the quality of services and improvements		Strength
<b>VII. Training</b>	Yes (3)	
Item 32: Provision of initial staff training		ANI
Item 33: Provision of ongoing staff training that addresses the necessary skills and knowledge.		Strength
Item 34: Provision of training for caregivers and adoptive parents that addresses the necessary skills and knowledge		Strength
<b>VIII. Service Array</b>	No (1)	
Item 35: Availability of array of critical services		ANI
Item 36: Accessibility of services across all jurisdictions		ANI
Item 37: Ability to individualize services to meet unique needs		ANI
<b>IX. Agency Responsiveness to the Community</b>	Yes (4)	
Item 38: Engages in ongoing consultation with critical stakeholders in developing the CFSP		Strength
Item 39: Develops annual progress reports in consultation with stakeholders		Strength
Item 40: Coordinates services with other Federal programs		Strength
<b>X. Foster and Adoptive Parent Licensing, Recruitment and Retention</b>	Yes (4)	
Item 41: Standards for foster family and child care institutions		Strength
Item 42: Standards are applied equally to all foster family and child care institutions		Strength
Item 43: Conducts necessary criminal background checks		Strength
Item 44: Diligent recruitment of foster and adoptive families that reflect children's racial and ethnic diversity		Strength
Item 45: Uses cross-jurisdictional resources to find placements		Strength

\*Systemic factors are rated on a scale from 1 to 4. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates "Not in Substantial Conformity." A rating of 3 or 4 indicates Substantial Conformity.

\*\*Items may be rated as a Strength or an Area Needing Improvement (ANI).